



## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/28775>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2017-12-05 and may be subject to change.

Analysis and Linguistic Concept Formation, a Course in Theory and Practice'' (pp. 147–167), and ''The Theory of Phonetics in the Practice of the Phonetician'' (pp. 168–193), where even the original manuscript is printed. The ''Literaturverzeichnis'' (pp. 194–203), also listing Ungeheuer's entire opus, is followed by a ''Subject Index'' (pp. 204–212) and a ''Name Index'' (pp. 213–214), where Chomsky is referred to only once. Though the editors are aware of the problematic character of this fragmentary publication, they must be congratulated for having carried out the difficult job: The collection represents a historical *and* an actual document which completes the picture of Gerold Ungeheuer, phonetician, and all-around scientist.

*Risø National Laboratory*

*DK-4000 Roskilde*

*DENMARK*

E-mail: Walter.Schumacher@risoe.dk

#### ENDNOTE

The English translations of the German titles are mine.

MAURO FERNÁNDEZ, *Diglossia: A comprehensive bibliography 1960–1990 and supplements*. Introduction by William F. Mackey. (= *Library & Information Sources in Linguistics*, 23.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1993. liii + 472 pp.

*Reviewed by* KEES VERSTEEGH

If we need any arguments against those who tell us that the days of the printed book are over and that all future books and research tools will be or should be available only in electronic form, the book under review here could serve very well in evidence. As the title indicates it aims to be a comprehensive bibliography of all publications connected with the concept of ''diglossia.'' Now, there is no doubt that an electronic carrier for the information contained in this book would have certain advantages: it could be updated very conveniently and it could be consulted interactively along any conceivable parameter. But the book under review here demonstrates the use of having a desk copy

that may be consulted instantaneously and with no limitations due to screen size. The publishers are to be congratulated for their courage in continuing to bring out books such as these against the tide of the electronic media and the clamour for computerized and digitalized information.

The above introduction serves only as a pretext to hide the embarrassment of this reviewer in trying to find something to say about Fernández' bibliography. One is at a loss to find words before this overwhelming amount of items on one notion. From the point of view of the historiographer of linguistics, however, it is easier to describe its qualities. Since Ferguson's 1959 article, the increase in publications on diglossia is documented accurately by this bibliography. The author indicates in his introduction the quantitative aspects of this development, and stresses the fact that even in specialized bibliographies on individual languages the number of items is far below that of his own bibliography. This is partly caused by his selectional criteria (all works are included that describe a linguistic situation as diglottic, regardless of whether or not the word is contained in their title), but also to his assiduity and relentless search for items on diglossia. The result is a book that from the historiographical point of view is a magnificent tool for anyone wishing to write the much-needed analysis of the development of the concept of diglossia.

One of the most interesting aspects of the literature about diglossia is the discussion about the terminology. The author of the bibliography does not go into this aspect, but there is an introductory essay by William Mackey, in which the history of the notion is dealt with. Since Ferguson's 1959 article dealt with four specific languages, Greek, Haitian, Swiss German and Arabic, much of the discussion has been held in the literature on these languages, especially in the literature on Arabic and Greek. The original strict definition of diglossia has gained currency in this literature, but in many cases the subsequent discussion remained outside the field. As a result, Arabists for instance still operate with the older definition, and it is very common to hear statements to the effect that in Egypt there is diglossia, whereas in North-Africa there is bilingualism. What they mean with such a statement is that the linguistic varieties in Egypt "belong to the same language," whereas in North Africa two different languages, Arabic and French, as well as the low variety of one of the two, are in use. According to newer definitions of diglossia (especially that of Fishman) a distinction would have to be made between the sociolinguistic notion of diglossia and the psycholinguistic one of bilingualism. Diglossia would then

become the term for a situation in which different varieties (either of the same language or of different languages) have a functional distribution. It is my belief that this modification of the notional apparatus is an improvement and it is a pity that the literature on individual languages is still largely unaware of this improvement.

In Mackey's introductory essay the origin of the term "diglossia" is traced to 19th century discussions in Greece on the "language question". In his analysis of the subsequent transformation of the concept, after its "official" introduction into linguistics by Ferguson, Mackey describes its integration in a general model of functional distribution of language varieties. He emphasizes the model character of the term: diglossia is a term, not a natural state, and as such it needs to be operationalized. This is an important *caveat*, since too many articles have been written within a framework that sought to establish whether or not a given language *is* diglottic. An example of such an essentialist approach is even found in Mackey's own essay, when he writes (p. xvii): "It was found, for example, that Norwegian was diglossic . . . and Czech was questionable . . .".

It is much more difficult to review this book from the point of view of the average user, who will in all probability be a student of a language exhibiting a variational pattern that could be described as diglottic. In my own case, this language is Arabic, and as such I am served particularly well, since the bibliography lists no less than 287 items on diglossia in Arabic. Let me say right from the start: I thought I knew the literature on this topic in my own field somewhat, but even so I found a large number of items (I won't say how many) I had never even heard of. If the situation for other languages is similar, and I have no reason to doubt that, the coverage is enormous.

This is not to say, obviously, that there are no items I know of that are not contained in the present bibliography (it would be surprising if there were none), but they are few and far between. To give just an example: in recent years there has been a lot of discussion on the teaching of Arabic as a diglottic language, and some of the publications that have resulted from these discussions could be added to the bibliography, for instance Dionisius Agiùs' collection of articles (1990). Another missing category would be the countless discussions, debates and controversies in the proceedings of the Arab Language Academies in Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad and Amman, in particular the first two. But it is doubtful that their inclusion would serve any purpose in this bibliography, since the majority of them are more



concerned with the language ideology and the language policies of the countries involved than with empirical data or theoretical refinements about the linguistic issues. Most of the earlier debates are reviewed anyway in Diem (1974), which is included, and in Hamzaoui (1965, 1975), which are not. A handy additional item is a short bibliography of Arabic sociolinguistics, Schmidt (1977).

The description of the items is immaculate. Much though I tried, I could find no inconsistencies in the system of bibliographical notation. In order to satisfy the requirements of a critical review I could note only one minor point, concerning the transcription of Arabic. It seems that the compiler has used different systems of transcription, and some of the titles simply contain too many errors in the use of the diacritic marks (e.g., Abdel-Malek 1971 "Al-ṣira' bayna al-Fuṣṣḥa waal-amiya. Aw a ar al-izdiwaj al-Lûghawiy fî ūslûb Yûsif al-Sibâ'î" should be "Al-ṣirâ' bayna al-Fuṣṣḥa wa al-'âmmiyya. Aw atar al-izdiwâj al-Lughawiy fî uslûb Yûsif al-Sibâ'î", at least if we follow the author's system of transcription in this item; elsewhere he uses, for instance, ġ for *gh* and ğ or *g* for *j*).

Special mention should be made of the indices, of which there are five: an index of languages, an index of items on diglossia in literature, an index of pedagogically oriented works, an index of theoretical works, and, an index of theses and dissertations. These are, of course, essential for the use of the book, and determine its success. The index of languages, in particular, makes it possible for researchers in any individual language to find out quickly what the literature on diglossia in 'their' language is. Most of the literature is on diglossia in English, German, French, Italian and Spanish, but there is also a sizeable number of items on Arabic, Greek, Catalan, Provençal, Creole languages and Tamil, as well as on a host of other languages. (Note, however, that there is no language called "Tashkent" and that the one reference to "Egyptian" is actually to an article on Chinese.)

Let me end by congratulating the author for his labour and the publishers for their courage in bringing out such a well-presented book.

*Vakgroep TCMO  
Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen  
Postbus 9103  
6500 HD Nijmegen  
The Netherlands*

## REFERENCES

- Agiùs, Dionisius A. 1990. *Diglossic tension: Teaching Arabic for communication*. Leeds: Folia Scholastica.
- Diem, Werner. 1974. *Hochsprache und Dialekt im Arabischen: Untersuchungen zur heutigen arabischen Zweisprachigkeit*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia". *Word* 15.325–40.
- Hamzaoui, Rached. 1965. *L'académie arabe de Damas et le problème de la modernisation de la langue arabe*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- . 1975. *L'académie de langue arabe du Caire: Histoire et oeuvre*. Tunis: Université de Tunis.
- Schmidt, Richard W. 1977. "Arabic sociolinguistics: A selected bibliography". *Sociolinguistics newsletter* 8.10–17.

WILLEM JOSEPH DE REUSE, *Siberian Yupik Eskimo: The language and its contacts with Chukchi*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994. xiii + 480 pp.

Reviewed by ANTHONY P. GRANT

This book is the first of the SSILA Book Award winners to be published under the auspices of the University of Utah Press. The original 1988 University of Texas doctoral dissertation, of which this book is a slightly revised version, won the award, presented by the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas, in 1990, and on pages ix–x we find prefatory notes from Catherine A. Callaghan, discussing the history of the SSILA Book Awards, and the late Wick Miller, welcoming this excellent book as the initiator of a new series.

The language under investigation, Central Siberian Yupik Eskimo (CSY),<sup>1</sup> is spoken on the Chukotka Peninsula, in the easternmost part of the (formerly) Soviet Far East (not Siberia proper), and also on St Lawrence Island, Alaska. The work under review includes a considerable amount of material collected by de Reuse from speakers whose homes are in the two villages on St Lawrence Island, namely Savoonga and Gambell, though most of the fieldwork itself was conducted in Nome, where another variety of Yupik, not easily intelligible to speakers of CSY, is spoken. The language was provided with a phonemic